

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/938,223	08/23/2001	Thomas A. Baudendistel	DP-305926	1694
75	590 08/20/2002			
Scott A. McBain			EXAMINER	
Delphi Technol Mail Code: 480		BUDD, MARI	K OSBORNE	
P.O. Box 5052 Troy, MI 4800	07-5052		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2834	
			DATE MAILED: 08/20/2002	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•

~***	A	Summary
(ITTIAA	AATIAN	CIIMMAN/
OIIII:	ACHUNI	JUHHIMIV

Application No. 938 723	Applicant(s) Bardendistel
Examiner Box 4	Group Art Unit

Office Action Summary	Examiner But	Group Art Unit
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe		
Davied for Donly		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	TO EXPIRE	MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by defau Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta 	reply within the statutory minimult, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from	um of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communication .
Status /	•	
Responsive to communication(s) filed on	-07	
☐ This action is FINAL .		
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 19		
Disposition of Claims		
★Claim(s)		is/are pending in the application.
Of the above claim(s)		is/are withdrawn from consideration.
□ Claim(s)		is/are allowed.
☐ Claim(s)		is/are rejected.
☐ Claim(s)		
□ Claim(s)		
Application Papers		requirement.
☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawi	ng Review PTO-948	
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	- -	□ disapproved.
☐ The drawing(s) filed onis/are objection		
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.		
$\hfill\Box$ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	- , , ,	•
 □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority or a line of the CERTIFIED copies or a received. 	of the priority documents ha	•
 □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority or a claim for foreign prior	of the priority documents has	ve been
 □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority of the CERTIFIED copies of the CERTIFIED copies of received. □ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Num 	of the priority documents hat ber)ternational Bureau (PCT R	ve been ule 1 7.2(a)).
 □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority on the All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies on the received. □ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Numular or preceived in this national stage application from the Interest of the CERTIFIED copies of the CERTIFIED	of the priority documents hat ber)ternational Bureau (PCT R	ve been ule 1 7.2(a)).
 □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority in the control of the CERTIFIED copies of the CERTIFIED copies of the control of the copies cop	of the priority documents ha	ve been ule 1 7.2(a)).
 □ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d) □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority on the All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies on the received. □ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Numular or preceived in this national stage application from the Interest of the CERTIFIED copies of the CERTIFIED	of the priority documents haber)ternational Bureau (PCT R	ve been ule 1 7.2(a)).

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 9-97)

Part of Paper No._

Application/Control Number: 09/938,223

Art Unit: 2862

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1-6, 8, 11, 13, 14 and 16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being clearly anticipated by Japan.

Note rotor #30, flexible status #20 and non-rotating actuator means #10, #11.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7, 9, 10, 12, 15 and 17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japan in view of Tojo, Humphreys or Richter.

Japan teaches the harmonic motor structure using piez-electric drive elements. Selection from among known materials has long been held to be within the skill expected of the routineer. The specific transducer materials claimed (magneto-strictive) (electro-magnetic) are well known as taught e.g. by Tojo, Humphreys and Richter. Thus to substitute an electro-magnetic or magneto-strictive transducer element for the piezo electric elements of Japan would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Due to the newly cited art the above rejections are <u>not</u> made final.

Art Unit: 2862

M BUDD/pj

08/14/02

MARY EXAMINER